

REMARKS**I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 30, 32, 36-38, 40, 43, 44, 48, 49 and 53-58 are pending and stand rejected under one or more sections of 35 U.S.C.

Claims 1-29, 31, 33-35, 39, 41, 42, 45-47 and 50-52 are canceled.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph:

1. Claims 30-33, 36-39, 53 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Each rejection will be addressed in the order presented.

Claim 30 has been amended to recite a "golf ball mold" rather than "a golf ball mold with dimples" thereby rendering the enablement rejection thereof moot. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 30 are respectfully requested.

Claim 30 has been amended to remove the limitation drawn to the stoichiometry of the prepolymer to the curing agent thereby rendering the enablement rejection thereof moot. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 30 are respectfully requested.

Claim 37 has been amended to remove the limitation directed to pre-and post-cure compression values for the core thereby rendering the enablement rejection thereof moot. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 37 are respectfully requested.

Claim 53 has been amended to recite the thread winding layer is sprayed with polyurethane. The amendment renders the rejection of the claim thereof

moot. Reconsideration and removal of the § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 53 are respectfully requested.

Claim 54 has been amended to eliminate the limitation drawn to a flexural modulus range thereby rendering the enablement rejection thereof moot. Reconsideration and removal of the enablement rejection of claim 54 are respectfully requested.

2. Claims 30, 32, 3, 36-39, 43, 48-50 and 53-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 12, first paragraph. Claims 30, 43, 48, 54, 55 and 58 have been amended to recite the specific species of diisocyanate disclosed in the specification. As conceded by the examiner, the specification is enabling for toluene diisocyanate, 4,4'-diphenylmethane diisocyanate, isophorone diisocyanate and mixtures thereof. The amendments render the claim rejections thereof moot. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 30, 43, 48, 54, 55 and 58 are respectfully requested.

Claims 32 and 36-39 depend, directly or ultimately, from claim 30 and are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 30. Claims 49, 50 and 53 depend from claim 48 and are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 48. Claims 56 and 57 depend from claim 55 and are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 55. Reconsideration and removal of the rejections of claims 32, 36-39, 49, 50, 53, 56 and 57 are respectfully requested.

Claim 33, 39 and 50 have been canceled thereby rendering the claim rejections thereof moot.

3. Claims 30-33, 36-39, 44-46 and 48-58 stand rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as being non-enabled for any diamine curing agent. Claims 30, 44, 48, 54, 55 and 58 have been amended to recite diethyl-2,4-toluenediamine and dimethylthio-2,4-toluenediamine as curing agents. As conceded by the examiner, the specification is enabling for these curing agents. The amendments to these claims renders the non-enablement rejections thereof moot. Reconsideration and removal of the rejections of claims 30, 44, 48, 54, 55 and 58 are respectfully requested.

Claims 32, 36, 37 and 38 depend, directly or ultimately, from claim 30 and are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 30. Claims 49, 50, 51 and 53 depend from claim 48 and are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 48. Claims 56 and 57 depend from claim 55 and are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 55. Reconsideration and removal of the rejections of claims 32, 36, 37, 38, 49, 50, 51, 53, 56 and 57 are respectfully requested.

Claims 31, 33, 39, 45, 46, 50, 51 and 52 are canceled thereby rendering the rejections thereof moot.

4. Claims 30, 31, 33, 36-40, 43-51 and 53-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as being non-enabled for the use of any polyol to produce a golf ball cover. Claims 30, 40, 43, 44, 48, 54, 55 and 58 have been amended to recite polyoxytetramethylene ether glycol as the polyol. As conceded by the examiner, the specification is enabling for PTMEG as the polyol in the prepolymer. Reconsideration and removal of the rejections of claims 30, 40, 43, 44, 48, 54, 55 and 58 are respectfully requested.

Claims 36, 37 and 38 depend, directly or ultimately, from claim 30 and are

allowable for the same reasons given for claim 30. Claims 49 and 53 depend from claim 48 and are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 48. Claims 56 and 57 depend from claim 55 and are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 48. Reconsideration and removal of the rejections of claims 36, 37, 38, 49, 53, 56 and 57 are respectfully requested.

Claims 31, 33, 39, 45-47, 50 and 51 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejections thereof moot.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 30-33, 36-41, 43-52 and 54-58 stand rejected as being obvious over Kato et al. ('852) or GB 2301291, each in view of Wu ('673), Isaac ('568) and Presswood ('298). Claims 30, 40, 43, 44, 48, 54, 55 and 58 have been amended to recite the specific species of diisocyanate, polyol and curing agent blend. As conceded by the examiner, neither Kato et al. nor GB 2301291 show or suggest the use of polyurethane covers on golf balls. Wu fails to disclose a prepolymer made from a diisocyanate selected from the group consisting of toluene diisocyanate, 4, 4'-diphenylmethane diisocyanate; isophorone diisocyanate and mixtures thereof and polyoxytetramethylene ether glycol as the polyol. Wu and Presswood fail to show or suggest a polyurethane cover formed by reacting a prepolymer with a curing agent blend of diethyl-2,4-toluenediamine and dimethythio-2,4-toluenediamine.

There is no teaching, suggestion or motivation in Kato et al., GB 2301291, Wu and/or Presswood to combine the references so as to combine the precise

diisocyanates, polyol and curing agent blend recited in the claims to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention. To find otherwise would require the application of impermissible hindsight reasoning. In the light of the amendments made, reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 30, 40, 43, 44, 48, 54, 55 and 58 are respectfully requested.

Claims 32 and 36-38 depend, directly or ultimately, from claim 30 and are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 30. Claim 49 depends from claim 48 and is allowable for the same reasons given for claim 48. Claims 56 and 57 depend from claim 55 and are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 55. Reconsideration and removal of the rejections of claims 32, 36-38, 49, 56 and 57 are respectfully requested.

Claims 31, 33, 39, 41, 45, 46, 47, 50, 51 and 52 have been canceled thereby rendering the rejections thereof moot.

Claim 53 stands rejected as being obvious over Kato et al. or GB 2301291, each in view of Wu, Isaac and Presswood as applied to claims 30-33, 36-41, 43-52 and 54-58, and further in view of Ford et al. ('280). Claim 53 depends from claim 48 and is allowable for the same reasons given for claim 48. Ford et al. fails to address the noted deficiencies with respect to the improper combination of the Kato et al., GB 2301291, Wu and Presswood references to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 53 are respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion:

For all the foregoing reasons, the claims are considered enabled and are considered to define patentably over the prior art. Reconsideration is requested and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark D. Lorusso', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

Mark D. Lorusso

Reg. No. 41,955

Lorusso & Associates

3 Pinecrest Terrace

Portsmouth, NH 03801

Tel: (603) 427-0070

Fax: (603) 427-5530

Email: mlorusso@lloplaw.com

Attorneys for Applicant

Docket No.: DSCK-525-C3

Date: May 15, 2006